



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/576,171

04/18/2006

Andrey V. Belogoloyi

42P21070

7335

45209

7590

01/29/2010

INTEL/BSTZ

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY

SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

VO, DON NGUYEN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2611

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/29/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/576,171	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BELOGOLOVYI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Don N. Vo	<b>Art Unit</b> 2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-19 and 21-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-19 and 21-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Acknowledgment***

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed on 11/09/2009.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The dependency of claim 3 should have been changed to claim 1 since claim 2 was cancelled by the Amendment filed 11/09/2009. For the purpose of examination, claim 3 will be treated as to depend from claim 1.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 3-19 and 21-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen et al (US 7,221,714).

Regarding claims 1, 9, 10, 17-19, 21, 22, 26 and 27, Shen, as shown in figures 6A, 6B, 8, 9 and 36A, teaches all subject matter claimed except for the transmission of at least 10 giga bits/s over a communication medium. See also column 2, lines 62-65; column 3, lines 14-19; column 19, lines 9-25 and column 33, line 61 to column 34, line 22. However, to transmit signal at a rate of at least 10 giga bits/s is well known in the art of digital communications and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Shen by employing the transmission of at least 10 giga bits/s over a particular communication medium since it is just a matter of selecting a particular rate for transmission and such modification would not involve any inventive feature.

Regarding claims 3 and 11, Shen, as shown in figure 36A, teaches all subject matter claimed except for using the LDPC encoding technique. However, such LDPC

Art Unit: 2611

coding technique is well known in the art of digital communications and is a specific type of FEC coding and Shen teaches FEC coding. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the encoding technique of Shen by using LDPC coding since it is just of one of the alternative way of encoding the symbols and such modification would not involve any inventive feature.

Regarding claims 4 and 12, Shen further teaches selecting of 4 bits for the symbol wherein the coded bits are three bits ( $N$  as claimed) and uncoded bit is one bit ( $N/3$  as claimed).

Regarding claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 23 and 24, Shen further teaches mapping using constellation table. See Fig. 36A.

Regarding claims 7, 8, 15, 16 and 25, Lin further teaches receiving and decoding the received bit stream which has uncoded bits and coded bits (figures 8 and 9) and generating the bit stream representing data. See column 15, line 31 to column 17, line 17.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-19 and 21-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

8. **Examiner's note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Art Unit: 2611

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. References How (US 5,408,502) and Eroz et al (US 7,577,207) are cited because they are pertinent to the method and apparatus for coding (Eroz teaches LDPC coding) and transmission of symbols comprising 4 bits.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Don N. Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3018. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (9:00AM - 6:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MOHAMMAD GHAYOUR can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Don N. Vo/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2611